

CDPAC MEETING
Thursday, April 5, 2001
State Capitol Building

Welcome and Introductions

Opening Remarks, *Kathy Malaske-Samu*, Chairperson

Ms. Malaske-Samu called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Committee, staff and audience members introduced themselves.

She congratulated Joyce DeWitt and Joyce Hanson on their appointments to their local Prop 10 Commissions.

Public Input and Announcements

Kim Johnson, Solano County Child Abuse Prevention Council is sponsoring an event on April 28th "Every Child Loved, No Child Lost" Conference. Dr. Perry will be presenting. Contact: Children's Network at (707) 421-7229.

Dee Cuney expressed her concern that there is no representation for family child care on the Committee and asked that this be shared with the Governor. Ms. Malaske-Samu suggested this be communicated directly to the Governor's office. Joyce DeWitt asked that, until this role is filled, everyone please remember that she is a friend to family child care and represents those concerns.

Viviane Schupbach, a representative of CCDAA, announced that a meeting in support of SB 993 will take place on the Capitol steps on April 18. This bill would give child development programs the same cost of living increase (COLA) as was provided to K-12 workers.

Employer Tax Credits

Lizelda Lopez, Office of Assembly Member Manny Diaz

Ms. Lopez thanked the Committee for allowing her to present information about AB 866 and introduced Gina Rodriguez from Speidel Publishing, who has been instrumental in crafting language for the bill. The energy crisis prevents them from being bolder with the bill, but they want employers to know that this credit will not go away anytime soon. The bill would extend the sunset on employer tax credits from 2003 to 2007 and would allow employers to reimburse employees directly. She said she is available to answer questions, just give her a call at (916) 319-2023.

Ms. Rodriguez said that Speidel Publishing educates tax professionals to utilize this tax credit. The credit allows employers to pay for child care without any out-of-pocket expenses to the company. As an example, she said that as an employee of a small business, she is reimbursed for child care for her three children.

A motion was made and seconded and the Committee voted unanimously to support AB 866 and to send a letter to Assembly Member Diaz to acknowledge this support.

Child Care for Children in Foster and Kinship Care

Alice Bussiere, Youth Law Center

Ms. Bussiere thanked the Committee for allowing her to speak today and introduced Stuart Oppenheim from San Mateo County and Jamille Moens from Assembly Member Simitian's Office.

AB 1105 would provide child care for foster children. The bill brings together youth advocates, foster parents, child care providers, and child development policy people. Previously, the focus has been on the benefits of child care to foster parents; but foster children actually reap the greatest benefits. The bill would provide a mechanism to pay for child care for foster children and allow for federal financial participation by using funds available through Title IV-E of the federal Social Security Act. This would mean that the federal government would pay 50 percent of the child care costs for foster children in California. The bill includes protections to be sure that child care is appropriate for a foster child by requiring that the care provided be licensed and included in the child's case plan.

Mr. Oppenheim talked about the current foster care crisis. There are over 100,000 children in foster care in California and only 46,000 licensed beds. Although about half of these children are with relatives there are still more children than beds. In addition to the need for more foster parents, California has an unprecedented high cost of living. For example, in Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties, the median price for a house is over \$500,000. Foster parents who receive only \$400-\$500 a month must pay about \$800 a month for child care because they both have to work. It's tragic when it must bankrupt the people we want to care for our children. For us, providing child care for foster parents isn't just a nice thing to do, it's a necessity.

Q. Is kinship care covered in this bill?

A. Yes, for children who are eligible for foster care benefits. Some kinship care givers are outside the foster care system.

Q. Is there criteria for which foster children go into child care? How is that decision made?

A. The bill doesn't include criteria. It says that the determination must be made by the child's social worker.

Comment: Sometimes social workers have not had the training to understand the importance of child care or how to match a child with an appropriate care giver. The suggestion was made that both training and ongoing support for social workers should be included in the legislation.

Response: That's beyond the scope of this bill. However, the Youth Law Center and the Child Care Law Center brought together a group of child care and welfare professionals last October to talk about these issues. They are in the process of deciding what kind of cross-training project could make that expertise available.

Comment: Cultural diversity also needs to be addressed in social worker training. An example was given of a large family of young Hmong children who do not speak English being placed among several non-Hmong families that speak only English and how traumatic this can be for children.

Response: Beyond training for social workers, this example underlines the need for more foster homes so that siblings can be placed together in culturally appropriate homes.

Q. Are foster families eligible for subsidized child care?

A. Yes. The income calculation is based on the foster care payment for the child and not on the family's income. This tends to move foster children up on the list. However, the problem is the limited numbers of subsidized spaces available. This is one of the problems being addressed by this legislation. Title IV-E funds are entitlement monies and therefore are not capped like the Block Grant funds that pay for child development programs. This means that eligible foster care children would receive this child care benefit and that the subsidized care slots would be available for other children. The 50 percent non-federal share of costs must be supplied by the state and usually is shared between the counties and the state. Assembly Member Simitian's office is working on the details of this non-federal match.

Q. Would this be a pilot or a statewide program?

A. Federal law requires that the program be available statewide in order to obtain the federal dollars.

A motion was made and seconded and the Committee voted unanimously to support AB 1105.

Child Abuse Prevention Month

Carolyn Ortiz, Chief, Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP), California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

Robin Coyle, Division Manager, Sacramento County Child Abuse Prevention Council

Jill Harper, Director of Child Development Programs, Placer County Office of Education

Ms. Ortiz has been with OCAP for four weeks and looks forward to working with the Committee. The mission of OCAP is to help families and communities protect children by promoting and integrating best policies, practices and research in child abuse prevention, intervention and treatment. OCAP is looking at ways to mainstream best practices among programs in the child welfare system. At the request of the Governor, a child welfare stakeholders' group is reviewing the child welfare system and making recommendations. This group will convene a summit on May 10 and 11 in Anaheim. The purpose is to share what the group is doing and obtain input. OCAP has encouraged local Child Abuse Prevention Councils to hold activities for Child Abuse Prevention Month. Each year the Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect in Los Angeles holds a poster contest. Winning posters will be on display in the CDSS lobby during April.

Ms. Coyle described one of the Child Abuse Prevention Councils of Sacramento's training programs specifically for child care providers. Children age 0 to 5 are at the greatest risk for death due to abuse or neglect. They found that 85 percent of providers polled in an informal survey either did not know they are mandated reporters or did not know what the term meant. Providers are difficult to reach because they have children with them all day long. The Council wanted to make training more accessible to them. The center of their training effort is the three Rs of child abuse prevention - responsibility, recognition, and reporting. They have developed an online interactive website containing the training material. There is a bulletin board at the end to encourage connections for additional support.

Ms. Harper has been in her position for 13 years and was with Head Start for 14 years. She talked about the pros and cons of the priority for protective referrals for children in child care. The pros are that children are safe; they are learning in a developmentally-appropriate environment; the providers are building relationships in the community to help support families;

child care supports reunification efforts for the family and supports their accessing other services; and, providers are partners in the child protective system. The drawbacks are that space for the children may not be available when referrals are made; referrals can mean that too many children with special needs end up in the same program, making it difficult to provide an effective program or to maintain an appropriate classroom; there is not enough time or money to train staff in subsidized centers; and, private providers are reluctant to take referred children because they do not feel they can adequately meet the child's needs and often there is an angry parent involved.

Committee members spoke in support of the need for training dollars and resources and the difficulties of caring not only for children with intense needs but also caring for the increasing numbers of children from immigrant populations. Training and support are not enough, however. Consideration must be given to child-adult ratios when working with children who are experiencing separation and loss.

Q. Are abused and neglected children truly the first priority for enrollment in subsidized care?

A. Yes, they have a priority for all CDE programs except CalWORKs child care. If it is not happening, then there is a compliance issue.

Ms. Malaske-Samu noted that often these children are not getting treatment for trauma, and we are doing a disservice to children and to our profession if we assume that these needs are getting met. We are getting more complicated children and have less trained staff which then compounds into high turnover, which then complicates the needs of the child. Dr. Poulsen suggested thinking of a therapeutic child care model when numbers of children have these needs and therapeutic child care strategies when one or two children in a group have these needs. In California, an infant-family-preschool mental health model is being piloted in eight counties.

Committee members discussed the availability and need for preschool day treatment programs to serve children with more severe behavioral or mental health needs. It was noted that just as child development specialists need to network with mental health providers, so do mental health providers need to network with child development specialists.

Ms. Malaske-Samu said she recently learned of deliberate skirting of Child Protective Services (CPS) as a first priority. The Committee needs to document this situation and determine how to address it. Mr. Jett said that CDE consultants could look into this. He stated that this is a compliance issue: if priority is not being given, providers are not following eligibility requirements.

Linda Parfitt suggested that programs could link with Head Start for resources to build in an intervention model. Cheryl Allen commented that an agency making a diagnosis must be involved in the planning and support of the child's plan while they are in the child care center.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked the presenters and said she would like the Committee to work on these issues.

Evaluation of the Local Child Care Planning Councils – Preliminary Findings by the American Institutes for Research (AIR)

Deborah Montgomery, Project Director

Gabriele Phillips, Project Manager

Michael Jett introduced the speakers. AIR has contracted with the California Department of Education (CDE) to perform this evaluation, which was requested by the field.

Ms. Montgomery gave an overview of the project. They are in the process of developing the draft report findings and recommendations. The evaluation project began last summer. Five Local Planning Council (LPC) coordinators are on the advisory committee. The guiding research questions were: What is the nature of LPC membership and activities, that is, how do they use time and resources; and, how effective are they in conducting periodic needs assessments and identifying local priorities for state and federal funds? They looked at implementation, effectiveness, and barriers. The evaluation does not address compliance. They surveyed all LPC coordinators and a sample of LPC members and received a 100 percent response rate. They also interviewed state consultants that work with LPCs. Results will be used to help improve how services are delivered through LPCs. They joined forces with CDPAC in order to identify some of the training issues. The survey addressed how the consumer representative categories are being filled, scheduling meetings, attendance strategies, how decision-making is carried out, what collaboration is happening locally and what are the barriers and facilitating factors for true collaboration. AIR defined four levels of collaboration and asked coordinators to report on levels of collaboration with each of 40 local agencies. They also reviewed the needs assessments being submitted to the Child Development Division (CDD) and tried to identify some of the barriers in getting the required data.

Ms. Phillips gave highlights from the survey. Questions were asked about administrative staffing, LPC membership and collaborations. Barriers around time and budget constraints were identified. Questions addressed the difficulties of coordinating roles and schedules. They looked at the problem of obtaining child care supply and demand data at the zip code level and at the struggle to raise the awareness of child care as a priority at the local level. They looked at the representation of the required membership categories and learned that the consumer category is the most difficult for which to ensure representation and attendance at meetings. A major focus of the survey was collaboration. AIR identified 41 potential partners LPCs could work with and asked them to rate their level of involvement with each of the partners that exist in their community. They found that LPCs are highly involved with a core set of child care providers. Other potential partners are less involved. These include city councils, city staff, mental health services, foster care, housing and labor departments, and transportation services. They tended to have more collaboration with agencies that were represented on the LPC. Whether the community was urban or rural did not effect the level of collaboration. The most chronic training and technical assistance needs identified were information about program initiatives, information on how to maximize local planning grants, and how to work effectively with Boards of Supervisors and County Superintendents of Schools. There is also a need for training about data collection and analysis. LPCs are improving the data collection process for their required periodic needs assessments. There are barriers to collecting certain data because of the lack of baseline data and zip code level data, and the fluidity of child care supply and demand. AIR is making four recommendations based on the survey. (1) Develop a standard format for the child care needs assessment while allowing for local flexibility. (2) Continue to provide training and technical assistance in the area of data collection and analysis. (3) Develop standard data element definitions to ensure that data elements are clearly understood among all counties. (4) Provide funding for LPC coordinators so they can remain in their jobs and thereby help LPCs maintain relationships with collaborative partners.

Q. Ms. Malaske-Samu asked how to assure that data collection and analysis done by non-researchers is accomplished efficiently and well.

A. It is important to provide consistent and clear definitions of what is being looked for. It is helpful to provide information about how to accomplish data collection, that is, where to go, how to get the data, etc. AIR also is recommending that the survey information be sent to all LPCs to allow them to see where other counties are getting data, what their barriers and concerns are, etc.

Ms. Montgomery said that LPCs also were concerned about how to go from data collection to setting local priorities.

Q. Who was surveyed in the LPCs?

A. There were two surveys. One survey was completed jointly by the coordinator and chair. A sample of 16 LPCs were asked to distribute another survey to their members. AIR received a coordinator/chair survey from every LPC and 16 sets of member surveys. They were impressed by the consistency between member and coordinator responses. Respondents were asked to identify their agency and the level of collaboration with the LPC.

Q. To what extent were the regional centers involved in the collaboration?

A. That is not clear because there was a design flaw which caused respondents to confuse regional centers with regional resource centers.

Q. When will the report be available?

A. The draft report will be submitted to CDE next month. The final report is due in June. CDD will be responsible for getting copies to the LPCs.

Ms. DeWitt expressed her appreciation to Mr. Jett that CDE is providing sound research to help move the process LPC forward. Ms. Ryan complimented AIR on including LPC representatives on the advisory committee and on the level of response they inspired from participants.

Donna Beveridge commented that the needs assessment process is getting easier with experience and refinements.

There was discussion about the difficulties of assessing the demand for child care for certain populations, for example, migrant children, children at risk for abuse and neglect, and special needs children. Some of this information may be available in the new census data.

Kathy Walker expressed gratitude to state staff for their leadership and support to the LPCs.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked the presenters.

Committee Business and Staff Report

The March 1, 2001 minutes were approved unanimously.

Director's and Staff Report

Kay Ryan, Executive Director

Ms. Ryan requested approval for the contract with the Prop 10 California Children and Families Commission to sponsor the CDPAC conference. It was moved, seconded and the Committee voted unanimously to approve the contract.

She invited everyone to join staff at the CDPAC office for refreshments following the meeting.

Ms. Ryan attended the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) Conference in Washington, D.C. The conference was dedicated to David Liederman, who died in January. He championed the issues of vulnerable youth and their families. His career, which began as a youth worker in the projects of Boston, included two terms in the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He served as Commissioner of the State Office for Children, Chief of Staff to Governor Michael Dukakis, Executive Director of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, and 15 years as the Executive Director of CWLA.

The conference occurred simultaneously with the NACCRRRA (National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies) conference and included an overlapping session where Marian Wright Edelman previewed the Children's Defense Fund's 2001 Legislative Agenda – the Act to Leave No Child Behind. One element of the Act is the goal of full funding for quality Head Start, child care and preschool programs. A strategy will be “Wednesdays in Washington and Back Home.” This is based on “Wednesdays in Mississippi” where every Wednesday in 1964 interracial teams of women went to Mississippi to bear witness for racial justice and to build bridges between white and black women across income and racial lines. Each was required to commit to work back home to inform and mobilize their communities about what they saw and what could be done. CWLA and NACCRRRA presented their Legislative Agendas for the year and it was powerful to see the intersecting strategies and shared goals for children and families. It was like seeing a train materialize on our historically parallel tracks. CWLA will host a National Child Care Conference from October 31 to November 2 in Cleveland. Information will be on their website this summer at www.cwla.org.

At the federal level, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) both are up for reauthorization. It is difficult to predict how either will go. President Bush's budget blueprint showed an increase in the CCDBG, but also established a set aside for after school and voucher programs. There is concern that this would displace existing funds. More will be known when a more detailed budget is submitted to Congress on Monday.

There now is a 27-member non-partisan Child Care Caucus founded by Congressman Bernard Sanders (Vermont) and dedicated to making child care a national priority. Members have agreed to move bipartisan legislation forward to address the three basic elements of the child care crisis -parents are paying too much, child care workers are making too little, and quality child care often is not available. They will look at extending the child care tax credit to \$1,000 and making it refundable and will look at successful child care models. They are requesting appropriations of \$1 billion for the CCDBG, \$1 billion for Head Start, and \$1.5 billion for 21st Century Learning Centers.

Ms. Ryan reviewed three federal bills. Fact sheets are in the packets for today's meeting. S18- the Right Start Act, is a comprehensive child care bill. HR 1201- increases the income eligibility threshold for Head Start to families up to 150 percent of the poverty line. HR 17- the Younger Americans Act, establishes an Office of National Youth Policy in the White House and a Council on National Youth Policy. It authorizes \$5.75 billion over five years for state and local programs. It outlines activities that could be funded to benefit the target population of youth ages 10-19, especially those in correctional facilities and other out-of-home care, those who live in poverty, or are at risk of abuse, neglect or disconnection from family or school.

State Senator Alpert's SB 515 puts California in place to receive this money. Ms. Ryan urged everyone to contact their federal representatives and ask them to consider the needs of children and families before supporting a tax cut.

At the State level, the budget focus is on meeting the State's energy needs. The Governor's Budget released in January indicated that funding for CalWORKs Stage 3 child care will end July 31, 2001. It was believed at the time that funding for Stage 3 was pending the Administrative Review and the modeling that would result. However, the State and Consumer Services Agency received the data very late, so the economic modeling has not been completed. It seems clear that no new money will materialize for this purpose which could leave us with only enough funding for Stage 3 in 2001-2002 to cover those people who go into Stage 3 in July. Ms. Ryan suggested this be the focus of the May meeting. The Committee will want to know the impact of this in human and economic terms. Will parents need to leave jobs and return to welfare without this support? How many and at what income levels? How would this exodus impact the labor market and TANF enrollment? Are there other resources that could bridge the gap for these families? Who will be responsible for helping them through this crisis? Basically, what is our plan? The surplus is gone, and, absent an unexpected infusion of funds, the Committee will want to think and talk about how to make the available funds go as far as possible.

Child Care Facilities Financing Program

In the last few weeks, CDPAC staff has met with staff from the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the Packard Foundation, Senator Polanco's Office, the Senate Budget Committee, and the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) regarding the Child Care Facilities Financing Program.

Sharon Rea Zone outlined the progress on this project, which began in December and is funded by a contract with HCD. The first step of the two-pronged approach is marketing outreach to be sure the field knows about this \$32 million resource and how to access it. Staff are hosting consumer focus groups and holding informational meetings throughout the State. They are developing marketing materials, developing a training curriculum and will disseminate those materials. The second step will be to conduct marketing research by hosting focus groups of vendors and lenders. The information from those groups will be used to identify barriers and develop policy recommendations.

Ms. Ryan talked about the involvement of the Packard Foundation. The Foundation was planning to provide focus groups to find out what people need to apply for the various loan programs and contacted CDPAC when they learned about this project. Their goal is to identify technical assistance needs for the various loan programs and develop an intermediary approach to meet those needs. They will collaborate with CDPAC to develop some of this information. Later, CDPAC and the foundation will target focus groups with lenders. Hopefully, as a result of these efforts, a year from now we will hear about how much easier it is for child care providers to find lenders appropriate for their needs and to successfully complete the loan packages.

Ms. Rea Zone said they met with staff from Senator Polanco's Office whose concern was that any unutilized funding could become a source of money to be used for the energy crisis. A report of CDPAC's preliminary findings is due to that office at the end of April. Staff will work with them and with the LAO to draft budget language to ensure that this program is more viable for child care providers.

Nominating Committee Report

Joyce Hanson said it was noted after last month's meeting that Marie Kanne-Poulsen has served two consecutive terms as Vice Chairperson and therefore is not eligible for re-election to that office. As a result, the Nominating Committee is amending the recommended slate of officers by changing the positions of two nominees. They recommend that Lynn Lucas be nominated as Vice Chairperson and Marie Kanne-Poulsen be nominated as Secretary.

2002 Conference

Leslie Witten-Rood reported that wrap-up activities have been completed for the 2001 conference and plans for the 2002 conference are underway. Conference evaluations suggested the next conference be limited to two days and not held on or near a holiday. Members expressed a preference to continue to hold the conference in Sacramento.

School Readiness Initiatives

Sharron Goldstein reported on the two School Readiness initiatives. All meetings for the initiatives are open to the public. The first initiative, which Theresa Garcia discussed last month, is being co-led by Secretary of Education Kerry Mazzoni and Prop 10 Commission Chair Rob Reiner. It focuses on three elements: children's readiness for school, schools' readiness for children, and community supports for families. Current discussion concerns a pilot program. The next meeting has not been scheduled. Information is available at two websites: the California Children and Families Commission at www.ccfc.ca.gov, and the Office of the Secretary of Education at www.ose.ca.gov.

The second initiative is being put together by one of the seven work groups involved in developing the Master Plan for K-12 Education being convened by Senator Alpert. The chair of the School Readiness Work Group is Karen Hill Scott. A consultant is Sharon Lynn Kagan, who was a keynote speaker at the conference. Kathy Malaske-Samu is a member of the work group. A calendar of work group meetings and locations is in today's packet. In addition to providing a school readiness component to the K-12 Master Plan, they will create a stand-alone document that outlines school readiness components and visions for the future.

Legislation

Ronda Nelson reviewed current legislation.

- SB 793 (Battin) would require licensed daycare facilities to notify parents of any conviction for felony sex offense or specified crimes against a minor of persons who own, operate, live at or work at the facility.
- AB 297 (Kehoe) is one of three before and after school program bills. It would allow programs operated on a school site to operate up to 30 hours a week (the current limit is 20 hours) without a license or special permit if both before and after school services are provided.
- SB 390 (Escutia) would require the Department of Education in collaboration with specified agencies and organizations to develop a Master Plan to guide state agencies and local communities in meeting child care and development needs.

America's Child Care Crisis: A Crime Prevention Tragedy
Brian Lee, Policy Director, Fight Crime: Invest in Kids California

Brian Lee introduced Fight Crime, Invest in Kids – a National organization which was organized about 5 years ago to take a hard look at what works to prevent crime. Membership is comprised of sheriffs, district attorneys, police officers, district attorneys and victims of crime, among others. The California organization has a membership of about 106 district attorneys, sheriffs, police chiefs, plus the California Peace Officers Association. The organization promotes a four point plan and believes that all children and their families should have access to high quality child care. They have conducted surveys in which 91 percent - or 9 in 10 respondents - said that providing quality child care programs is a primary way of preventing crime; 75 percent selected child care and after school programs as having the most impact on reducing crime. Survey participants were police, sheriffs, district attorneys, etc.

In compiling their report entitled “America's Child Care Crisis: A Crime Prevention Tragedy,” Fight Crime, Invest in Kids looked at recent research, performed an assessment of child care in California, and convened an advisory committee of eleven child care experts. The basic conclusion of the report is that in California there is a critical shortage of quality, affordable child care and this poses a risk to public safety. Historically, people have always known that you have to start early in influencing the development of kids. The Perry Preschool results were astounding over the course of a longitudinal study which showed that control group kids who did not receive quality child care were five times more likely to be involved with crime at age 27 than the experimental kids. Other studies, broader in scale, reinforced the findings. A cost/quality/outcome study, in which California is one of four states involved, is evaluating 100 child care centers, whose children are, at this point, only through second grade. The longitudinal study shows that low income kids with low-quality care differed significantly in school success from those who had high quality care. A North Carolina Smart Start program longitudinal study looked at services connected with child care and found that the kids receiving services were half as likely to have problems later as the control group. The Chicago Child Parent Centers studied children through age 20. This large scale government funded study of 1000 kids, found that through age 18, the kids in the program were 60 percent less likely than the control group to have one arrest, and 50 percent less likely to have second arrest.

In addition to crime prevention, the research looked at education. The Perry Preschool study found that their kids in higher grades were more likely to earn high school diplomas. There were similar findings in Chicago. Economically, the Perry Preschool kids were four times more likely to earn more than \$25,000 per year.

Research has also looked at cost savings to the government and the public. According to a Rand study, for every one dollar invested in the Perry Preschool program there was \$2 saved in public money and a \$7 savings in cost avoidance of later involvement in the justice system and social welfare. Child care is a wise investment of public funds.

There is a critical shortage of quality care and a huge gap between the number of kids who need assistance/care and those who get it. Infant care in California costs over \$8,000 per year – six times the cost of sending an 18 year old to a public college. Over 1 million children in California are eligible for subsidized child care and only 1/3 are receiving assistance. It has been estimated that of that million, approximately 280,000 would use the subsidies. There is a serious gap in access; however, it's not just a question of access but also of quality. One in five programs in

California are rated as good or above on quality rating scales. As for accreditation rates, only 1 in 25 child care centers in California are accredited. Nationally, one in ten centers are accredited. A recent US Military overhaul of their child care program resulted in 97 percent of their centers becoming accredited. According to a report by the Women's Law Center, the changes in the military programs resulted in lower turnover, and all staff members receive health insurance. The California CARES Initiative is a good step toward quality in California's child care. Fight Crime, Invest in Kids recommends that the State serve all eligible children and raise reimbursement rates. Their membership has been talking with Legislators and with the Governor. In years ahead, they want to raise the profile of children's issues and hope their report will help move things forward.

Q. The research mentioned classifies child care in two categories – child care centers and child/parent centers. What's the difference between the two?

A. Most of the programs reviewed – the child/parent centers -- had a very significant element of home visiting and parent interaction/involvement.

Ms. De Witt stated that she was happy that someone outside the child care arena is making these points. Fight Crime's efforts are much appreciated.

Ms. Emmons stated that she participated in last month's legislative hearing on children at risk of abuse and neglect where similar points were made. We're tackling the problems too late when we are putting metal detectors in schools.

Donna Beveridge requested that Fight Crime, Invest in Kids look at the effect early intervention has on children with mental health issues as it pertains to crime prevention. Brian Lee responded that research shows that quality mental health programs make a difference in crime reduction. They're looking at the whole spectrum of mental health issues.

An audience member from Monterey stated that they recently opened a child care center with an on site behaviorist, and parent involvement effort. They have used the report to support their efforts to gather more resources for children. They've launched a capital campaign and brought community leaders together to show a power point version of the Fight Crime report. Their district attorney was very educated about brain development issues as a result of this report.

Ms. Malaske-Samu stated that one of the goals in LA County is to serve all eligible children under 15. They have been catching some criticism about how do-able this is. The Fight Crime report strengthens their case. Sometimes we forget who our real partners are.

Ms. Ryan related a story regarding a woman from Massachusetts – the governor called her to find out what to do about their child care crisis. She was surprised that he asked, and inquired where the question came from. The governor had been meeting with a group of business people and a bank president had asked for information. It was then that the governor realized it wasn't an issue of concern to only "whiny" child care advocates. Sometimes it's the "unlikely messenger" who gets heard.

State Department Reports

Cheri Schoenborn, Department of Developmental Services (DDS)

The Department continues to work on service delivery reform and has prepared a draft report, which addresses residential care services and reviews some of the day programs and respite care. It is intended to garner support for these issues. The report will be available in mid-May on the website – www.dds.ca.gov. Once it is released, there will be a 60-day public comment period.

On March 8th and 9th, the Department held a meeting to discuss “natural environments.” Over 200 participants attended the session in Burbank. They established a clearinghouse on research and program information, which may be accessed by calling 800-869-4337. They also received good input on defining the term “natural environments”: the group expanded the Colorado definition to include “everyday routines, relationships and partnerships.” A summary of the meeting outcomes will be made available to the Committee.

Additionally, the Department is planning to release a handbook to support curriculum for children in Early Start. The handbook will include information on how to access services needed by each child, work collaboratively with the child’s family, increase funding for regional centers, anticipate increased clinical staffing needs, and provide evaluation and training. Although this information is intended to benefit service coordinators, who are often new (due to high turnover) and must navigate through a complex service system with many players, it will be useful for foster care parents and foster care caseworkers as well as the regional centers.

Q. The handbook talks about fostering better collaboration between local regional resource centers and child care providers, but does it provide information on what to do?

A. It provides information on how to access services; however, there are several opportunities for child care providers to learn about caring for special needs children. WestEd is training child care providers about how to care for special needs children. Additionally, many child care providers participate in meetings and talk regularly with regional centers and special education providers. Each regional center has a case manager coordinator for children within each age category. Local planning coordinators can seek out these opportunities. Also, the Lanterman Act contains a provision to provide additional family support. Local regional centers can provide support over and above that which would meet a typically developing child’s needs.

Q. Within the regional centers, helpfulness is dependent upon personalities but I would like to see some sense or encouragement that coordination with Local Planning Coordinators is taking place.

A. Ms. Schoenborn stated that the Department can send out letters encouraging collaboration with the Local Child Care Planning Coordinators in each county.

Dr. Poulsen noted that the point of this program is to carry out the mandated initiative on services such as child care and foster care for children with disabilities. It is taking a look at how to collaborate at each local level. To accomplish this effort, it is also important to identify the people responsible. The University Affiliated programs can put together a list identifying the contacts, and, this list could accompany a DDS letter.

Michael Jett, California Department of Education (CDE), Child Care Division (CDD)

During the recent Budget Hearings, the Department was asked for a status report on the May Revise, specifically, some idea of what is being done with the data CDE provided. They also were questioned about the timeline for getting new program money out.

Two big issues:

- CalWORKs child care – reduced by \$97.8 million; this will leave Stage 2 child care significantly under-funded. The Department is working with the Department of Social Services to determine how to address this issue. Stage 3 was funded through July; after July 31, 2001, Stage 3 child care will not be available to families. The Legislative Analyst Office suggested that CDE take \$95.7 million (\$88 million in new federal dollars) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant funds to pay for Stage 3. This doesn't address the current shortfall in Stage 2 child care. The projected need is \$61 million. The LAO also suggested using carryover funds to fill the gap. The Department is exploring the idea of using some of these dollars, but have concerns about using this exclusively because of historical uses for those funds.
- Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) for K-12 – requested complete recovery of lost COLA – \$44 million needed. Funding was kept as an open issue. The COLA issue also includes a request to augment Resource and Referral agencies for back COLA and to reflect growth in CDE/CDD programs.

All fiscal items are being put over until May Budget Revision and resolution of the energy crisis.

Program funding activities include: General child care expansion – the Department received 376 applications, totaling \$175 million. Staff finished reading applications and is in the process of conducting site visits. State Preschool – \$24 million are available and 162 applications have been received. Playground Safety and Facilities Renovation and Repair – the Request for Applications is out and responses are due by May 11. Accreditation of Family Child Care Homes – applications are due April 27. CARES bill – the allocation formulas and guidelines have been developed. SB 1703 – the Department continues to work on the plan for how to spend the \$42 million in funding. The Department also sent out a second survey for the purpose of identifying available child care spaces for CalWORKs families. The survey response will be utilized to determine the number of designated slots. This information will be used to inform (by letter) parents of openings.

Ms. Malaske-Samu noted that Michael Jett and Kay Ryan both related that no one knows yet what the Administrative Review holds in store.

Mr. Jett replied that he has been involved in monthly meetings with Aileen Adams. In December, CDE provided data and the State and Consumer Services Agency hired consultants who will use the data for modeling. He stated that a report may be ready by May, but perhaps recommendations would not be.

Ms. Ryan suggested that the May 3rd CDPAC meeting was available for the Committee to focus on issues relevant to the May Revise.

Ms. Malaske-Samu considered the suggestion that the Committee look closely at the Administrative Review and prepare to respond to the May Revise.

Ms. Emmons suggested several options, including looking at a different date for the May meeting, taking up any issues in June or looking at an ad-hoc committee to work with Kay. She emphasized that it is important that the Committee has an opportunity to make its viewpoint known.

Ms. Malaske-Samu stated it is imperative that the Committee send a clear message about the need to look at the quality of care issues discussed today and at last month's meeting. It is critical that we continue to bring this message forward. The system is not working properly and it is critical that we address this.

Mr. Jett suggested that the enhanced COLA is an issue to focus on at budget hearings.

Ms. Malaske-Samu commented on the importance of focusing on the COLA issue because it will impact the quality of care children receive.

Ms. Malaske-Samu responded to a suggestion from the audience about making a formal request for a preview of the Administrative Review: We should have a statement on file that CDPAC respectfully requests a preview of the Administrative Review.

Lyn Vice, Chief, Child Care Bureau, California Department of Social Services (CDSS)

Ms. Vice introduced herself as the new chief of the Child Care Bureau; she noted that Jo Weber has reorganized her branch to allow more focus on mental health and other issues that are barriers to success for CalWORKS families. Ms. Vice also introduced managers Bobbie Holm and Valerie Malay (who is replacing Teri Ellen).

Ms. Vice provided an update on the Child Care Reserve: In FY 2000/01 the original reserve contained \$127.9 million for Stage 1 and Stage 2 child care. Of this amount, \$80 million was released as Stage 1 reserve in March; this was followed by a second release of \$30.4 million. After three funding releases (including the CDD reserve release of \$32.6 million in CCDBG funds), approximately \$17 million remains in the reserve.

Ms. Vice reporting on behalf of Dave Dodds, provided updates for Community Care Licensing: Revisions for school age child care will take effect on June 1, 2001. Licensing staff will receive training on the revised regulations in May. Also, during the month of May, all school age providers will receive a letter notifying them of the changes. Public hearings on the changes will be held in December 2001.

Q. What about the TANF reauthorization; what are the current issues and trends?

A. Congress' view of TANF is that the results have happened and the job is done. They are looking at cutting funds. In reality, the job is just beginning. We must educate legislators on the issues such as alcohol/drug use, mental health, domestic violence, etc., that are barriers to success. If child care funding gets lost in the congressional review, and there are no Stage 1 or 2 dollars, this would significantly prevent families from maintaining employment. The energy crisis and the state of the economy play a role, too. CCDF dollars are a drop in the bucket compared to what California is spending on energy.

Ms. Malaske-Samu expressed concern because we have re-vamped our state system to be very dependent upon federal dollars. She also stated that this completes the State Reports.

Ms. Ryan noted that information was not included in the state reports about the CARES Initiative.

Linda Parfitt noted that the California Children and Families Commission website (www.cafc.ca.gov) provides information about the new timeline and about the 14 counties funded, to date.

Ms. Malaske-Samu adjourned the meeting and invited everyone to the office to celebrate.

Attendees of April 5th, 2001 CDPAC meeting

Committee Members:

Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Chairperson
Joyce DeWitt, Public Member
Mary Emmons, Children's Institute International
Lynn Lucas, El Dorado County Supt. Of Schools
Cheri Schoenborn, Department of Developmental Services
Bonnie Parks, Employment Development Department

Marie Kanne-Poulsen, Vice Chairperson
Earl Peterson, Child Care Consultant
Joyce Hanson, Grandparent/Child Advocate
Amy Tan, Sacramento City College
Michael Jett, Department of Education

Participants:

Cherl Allen, CEITAN
Sonia Ortiz Mercado, California Community Colleges
Dee Cuney, Family Child Care
Irma Fraigun, CTA
Linda Parfitt, Department of Education
Donita Stromgren
Charlene Tressler, Child Development Associates
Timothy O'Connell, Children's Services International
Betty Futrell, Shasta County
KC Brown, LA Child Care and Development
Sabah Eltareb, CA State Library
Mary Arriaga
Gisela Erne, Victor Valley College
Elissa Provance, Center for Prevention & Early Intervention
Kim Johnson, Solano Local Planning Council, ChildNet
Dan Baker, US Department of Health and Human Services
Marcia Westbrook, Nevada County Local Planning Council
Greta Helm, San Mateo County Health Services Agency
Jamil Moens, Legislative Aide, Assembly Member Simitian

Donna Beveridge, San Bernardino LPC Coordinator
Barbara Coulibaly
Pat Dorman, On the Capitol Doorstep
Willa Pettygrove
Francine Nunes, Placer Child Care Council
Jolene Thomas, Shasta Local Planning Council
Kathy Walker, El Dorado Local Planning Council
Susanne Milton, El Dorado County of Education
Pamela Sorlagas, LA Child Care and Development
Keri Garner, 4-H Afterschool Child Care
Nicole Claffy, CA State Library
Gail Beyer
Mark Carlson, Lutheran Office of Public Policy
Carolyn Ortiz, Office of Child Abuse Prevention
Manny Castellanos, Children's Institute International
Marily Rotnem, Local Planning Council
Daisy Braxton, Department of Social Services
Alice Bussiere, Youth Law Center

Staff:

Kay Ryan, Executive Director
Ronda Nelson, Analyst
Leslie Witten-Rood, Analyst
Marie Acosta, Student Assistant

Sharron Goldstein, Analyst
Sharon Rea Zone, Analyst
Jeri Westerfeld, Staff